

REMARKS

The examiner rejected claims 6, 7 and 10 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Faour. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faour. Claim 14 was objected to due to mis-spelling.

The applicant has amended claim 6 to include the limitation: "said means for releasing said active fluid causing pressure on said means for holding in the presence of said predetermined target compound". The examiner has stated in her discussion of allowable subject matter: "Although Faour teaches a reservoir of active agent and a release orifice the compound selective polymer itself does not exert a pressure on the reservoir to expel the active agent..". The applicant believes the amended claim language overcomes the examiner's rejection because claim 6 contains the limitation that "said means for releasing said active fluid agent comprising a compound selective polymer". Thus, the means for releasing is now a compound selective polymer, and the means for releasing causes pressure on the holding means in the presence of a target compound.

Claim 7 has been amended to put the orifice in its proper place in the means for holding.

Claim 10 has not been substantively amended because by the argument above for claim 6, claim 10 also claims contraction or expansion to expel the fluid: "said polymer reservoir expanding or contracting in a presence of a target compound; said expansion or contraction expelling a portion of said active fluid agent into said environment". Expansion or contraction as a manner of expelling is not taught by Faour.

Claim 13, while teaching perfume, is dependent on claim 10. If claim 10 is patentable as the applicant argues above, the further limitation of the active agent being perfume cannot render the claim obvious over Faour since Faour teaches away from the other claim limitations. The dependent claim must be considered as containing all the limitations of the associated independent claim.

Claim 14 has been amended to correct the mis-spellings objected to by the examiner.

In light of the above, the applicant believes that the examiner will now find the claims allowable. The applicant therefore respectfully requests the examiner to place the case in condition for allowance at her earliest convenience.

Respectfully Submitted

Clifford Kraft

Clifford H. Kraft
35,229
Attorney of Record

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Clifford H. Kraft
320 Robin Hill Dr.
Naperville, IL. 60540

This paper is being placed in United States First Class Mail with sufficient postage addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA. 22313-1450 on Date: JULY 23, 2004
By: Clifford H. Kraft; Signature *Clifford Kraft*